Appl. No. 09/673,270 Amdt. dated April 26, 2005 Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 19-34 are pending. By the present Amendment, claim 21 has been amended to delete the text "in said step c)" and, accordingly, to overcome the objection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 set forth in the Office Action. The independent claims 19, 20, 27 and 28 have also been amended to more clearly recite an aspect of the present invention as discussed below. Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claim 32 if rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claim 32 as been amended to include the limitations of independent claim 28.

In the Office Action, claims 19, 20, 22-31, 33 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,345,440, to Gledhill et al (hereinafter referred to as the Gledhill et al patent). In response to the Amendment dated 23 September 2004, the Office Action states that the features of the present invention relied on by the Applicant to distinguish the present invention over the applied references are not recited in the rejected claims. Accordingly, the independent claims 19, 20, 27 and 28 have each been amended to recite each symbol being "differentially coded in the direction of the frequency axis." Thus, the subject matter of the independent claims of the present invention is clearly not anticipated by the Gledhill et al patent, which discloses OFDM signals differentially coded in the direction of the time axis as discussed in the Amendment dated 23 September 2004. Support for these claim amendments is provided on pages 12-14 and Figs. 2B and 3 of the substitute specification submitted with the Preliminary Amendment on October 13, 2000. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 19, 20, 22-31, 33 and 34 as being anticipated by the Gledhill et patent under 35 U.S.C. § 102 is therefore respectfully requested.

In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner Appl. No. 09/673,270 Amdt. dated April 26, 2005 Reply to Office Action of January 26, 2005

have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Stacey L Longanecker Attorney for Applicant Reg. No. 33,952

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. 1300 19th Street, N.W., Suite 600 Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 659-9076

Dated: 26 Optil , 2005